

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patriff and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO 150x 150 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,055	01/02/2004	Frederick J. Geiger	1974-P02395US02	1943
110	7590 06/15/2006		EXAMINER	
DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN			ALAM, SHAHID AL	
1601 MARKI SUITE 2400	ET STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2307			2162	
			DATE MAILED: 06/15/2000	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/751,055	GEIGER ET AL.	GEIGER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Shahid Al Alam	2162				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	tion appears on the cover	sheet with the correspondence a	ddress			
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL assions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to the toreply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS CO 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however tation. The period will apply and will expire S by statute, cause the application to	MMUNICATION.  ver, may a reply be timely filed  IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this of become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on .					
·		 ☑ This action is non-fina	I.				
3)□	<b>_</b>						
·	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the app	lication.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	i) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election requiren	nent.				
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. Note the	attached Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority do						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of t	· •		Stage			
* 0	application from the International	,	••				
3	See the attached detailed Office action for	or a list of the certified cop	Dies not received.				
Attach	was .						
Attachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	. □ ،	ntoniou Summer (DTO 442)				
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-	.948) F	nterview Summary (PTO-413) aper No(s)/Mail Date				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO r No(s)/Mail Date <u>05012006</u> .	0/SB/08) 5)	Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTo Other:	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/751,055 Page 2

Art Unit: 2162

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 16 are pending in this Office action.

## Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Page 3

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/059,049. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the similar limitations and they produce the same end result of collecting and distributing commercial data among commercial trading partner organizations.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to omit the additional elements of claim 1 to arrive at the claims 1 of the instant application because the person would have realized that the remaining element would perform the same functions as before. "Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform same functions as before." See In re Karlson (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184, decide Jan 16, 1963, Appl. No. 6857, U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

## **Contact Information**

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shahid Al Alam whose telephone number is (571) 272-4030. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00 A.M.- 4:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shanid Al Alam Primary Examiner Art Unit 2162